

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 2-4, 6, 8-10 and 12. These sheets, which include Figs. 1-12, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-12.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (6)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

The drawings have been objected to as containing cross-sectional hatching not in accordance with U.S. patent practice and procedure; Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Muto et al. in view of Endo et al.; Claims 3 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Muto et al. in view of Endo et al. and further in view of Yu et al.; Claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kimizuka et al. in view of Endo et al. and Muto et al.; and Claims 2, 12 and 13 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. New Claims 17-19 have been added and thus, Claims 1-19 remain active.

Considering first then the Examiner's objections to the drawings, it is to be noted that submitted herewith is a letter requesting entry of substitute drawings so as to provide proper cross-sectional hatching in Figures 2-4, 6, 8-10 and 12.

Considering next then the rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Muto et al. in view of Endo et al., it is noted that Claims 1 and 8 have now been amended to state that the reinforcing plate member has first and second end planes, wherein when the blade chip is in an original position, the first end plane is located at a predetermined distance from the distal end of the supporting plate, and wherein when the blade chip is in a changed position, the second end of the plane is located at the predetermined distance from the distal end of the supporting plate. In contrast, it is noted that the configuration of Muto et al. (including a blade chip, a support plate and a holder) and the cleaning blade mechanism 201 of Endo et al. are unable to achieve the aspect

of the present invention which is the capability of being able to switch the position of the blade chip so that the corner portions of the blade chip can be used at least twice before having to replace the blade chip (thus prolonging the longevity of the blade chip). For example, reference can be made to the first embodiment of the present invention in Figures 2 and 3 of the application. More specifically, it is impossible for the cleaning device 200 of Endo et al. to have its position switched in the manner provided in the blade chip in accordance with the present invention owing to the significant difference in length between the rubber plate member 220 and the reinforcing plate member 222. In other words, in Endo et al., only one side of the cleaning device 200 can be used for cleaning and the other unused side of the cleaning device 200 cannot be used for cleaning since the cleaning device 200 is unable to have its position switched, unlike the blade chip in accordance with the present invention. It is therefore submitted that each of Claims 1 and 8 and all claims dependent therefrom patentably define over Muto et al. and Endo et al.

Considering next then the rejection of Claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Muto et al. in view of Endo et al. and further in view of Yu et al. as well as the rejection of Claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kimizuka et al. in view of Endo et al. and Muto et al., it is respectfully submitted that neither Yu et al. nor Kimizuka et al. rectify the deficiencies noted herein above with regard to Endo et al. and Muto et al. It is therefore submitted that each of Claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 15 and 16 also merit indication of allowability.

The Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 2, 12 and 13 is hereby acknowledged and is sincerely appreciated. In response thereto, new Claims 17-19 have been added which correspond to original Claims 2, 12 and 13 but placed in independent form. It is therefore submitted that Claims 17-19 also merit indication of allowability.

Application No. 10/825,318  
Reply to Office Action of September 8, 2005

In view of the foregoing, an early and favorable Office Action is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:JDH\la

I:\ATTY\JDH\252000US-AM.DOC



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
James D. Hamilton  
Registration No. 28,421  
Attorneys of Record